

Appln No. 10/760246  
Amdt. Dated: November 09, 2006  
Response to Office Action of September 18, 2006

4

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 08 2006

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated September 19, 2006. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions.

**Amendment**

Page 1 of the specification has been amended to update US Application numbers with corresponding US granted Patent numbers in the Cross Reference to Co-Pending Applications. The Applicant submits that no new matter is introduced.

**35 U.S.C. §102 - Claims 1 and 5**

Claims 1 and 5 stand rejected for lack of novelty in light of US 6,439,908 to Silverbrook. The Applicant disagrees.

Claims 1 and 5 both define a printhead assembly that has two or more printhead modules, each module having a plurality of printhead integrated circuits. If the printhead assembly 10 is equated to the printhead module of claim 1, then the '908 reference does not teach an assembly with two or more printhead modules as required by claim 1. The citation teaches a printer with a single printhead assembly 10. There is no disclosure of the printhead 10 being assembled with other like printheads 10. There is no disclosure the printhead 10 being configured for interconnection with another printhead 10 in linear alignment with the first.

Accordingly, the cited reference does not teach all the elements of claim 1 or claim 5.

**35 U.S.C. §103 - Claim 2**

Claim 2 stands rejected as obvious in light of US 6,439,908 to Silverbrook in view of US 5,658,158 to Milan.

As discussed above, '908 fails to teach or suggest several elements defined in claim 1. The disclosure in Milan also fails to teach or suggest these elements. As claim 2 incorporates these elements by virtue of its indirect dependence from claim 1, it is clear that the citations fail to support a rejection on the basis of §103.

**35 U.S.C. §103 - Claim 3 and 4**

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,439,908 to Silverbrook in view of US 5,658,158 to Milan and US 6,180,002 to Higgins.

As discussed above, '908 and Milan fail to teach or suggest several elements defined in claim 2. The disclosure in Higgins also fails to teach or suggest these elements. As claims 3 and 4 incorporate these elements by virtue of its indirect dependence from claim 2, it is clear that the citations fail to support a rejection on the basis of §103.

Appln No. 10/760246  
Amdt. Dated: November 09, 2006  
Response to Office Action of September 18, 2006

5

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 08 2006

**Conclusion**


It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



---

Kia Silverbrook

---

Norman Micheal Berry

---

Garry Raymond Jackson

---

Akira Nakazawa

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762